Anaximander and the Zero Principle

The Relational Ontology of the Apeiron

Eli Adam Deutscher

Abstract

This paper reinterprets Anaximander of Miletus (c. 610–546 BCE) through the lens of the **Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalist (NPN)** framework, particularly its **Zero Principle (ZP)**: that any determinate system requires an indeterminate complement.[1] Against Aristotle's substance-oriented reading—which systematically recast the *Apeiron* as *hylē aoristos* (indefinite matter)—I argue that Anaximander's *Apeiron* is not an indefinite material substrate but the **necessary indeterminate ground** for the emergence of determinate entities.[2] His single preserved fragment (Simplicius, *Commentary on Aristotle's Physics*, 24.13) outlines a four-step cycle of identity: (1) the boundless ground (*Apeiron*), (2) the cut of individuation (*Adikia*), (3) the measure of distinction (Time), and (4) the re-cut of dissolution (*Dikē*). A rigorous etymological analysis reveals that Anaximander's specific lexical choices—contrasted with the substance-based vocabulary available to him—point decisively toward a **relational ontology** in which identity is temporary and maintained through contrast with an unbounded background.[3] The striking structural parallels with modern thermodynamics are not anachronistic but demonstrate that Anaximander intuited the logical architecture of identity that physics would later formalize—what the NPN framework terms the **General Zero Principle (GZP)**.[4] By recovering Anaximander's original insight through the NPN lens, we correct a longstanding Aristotelian misreading and establish the Zero Principle as a foundational metaphysical concept with enduring relevance for process philosophy, systems theory, and the philosophy of science.

[1] For the full formulation of ZP and the General Zero Principle (GZP), see Deutscher, 34-37 and Appendix B.

[2] Aristotle, *Physics* III.4, 203b7–15. For the standard Aristotelian interpretation, see Kirk, Raven, and Schofield, 105–23.

[3] For recent reassessments of Anaximander's systematic thinking, see Gregory, 43–83; Graham, 29–56.

[4] The isomorphism between Anaximander's cycle and thermodynamics is explored in detail in section 5.

Keywords: Anaximander, *Apeiron*, Zero Principle, General Zero Principle, relational ontology, etymology, Presocratic philosophy, thermodynamics, contrast, identity, time, Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalism

---

1 Introduction: Anaximander and the Problem of Ground

Anaximander of Miletus occupies a peculiar position in the history of Western philosophy. Recognized as the first to write a philosophical treatise (*On Nature*), his thought survives in fragments reported by later commentators, most notably a single, dense statement preserved by Simplicius (*Commentary on Aristotle's Physics*, 24.13).[5] Traditional interpretations, heavily influenced by Aristotle, have understood Anaximander's *Apeiron* (*ἄπειρον*) (the "Boundless" or "Unlimited") as an indefinite material principle—a kind of primordial stuff from which all things emerge and to which they return.[6] This substance-oriented reading has dominated scholarship for centuries, casting Anaximander as a primitive material monist.[7]

However, a closer examination of the etymological and conceptual structure of Anaximander's terminology reveals a different picture. The *Apeiron*, from *a-* (not) + *peirar* (boundary), is fundamentally **not a substance but a relational condition**: the absence of boundaries that makes boundaries possible.[8] Similarly, *Adikia* (*ἀδικία*) (injustice) and *Dikē* (*δίκη*) (justice) are not moral concepts but **ontological operations** of separation and reintegration.[9]

This paper advances a different thesis: Anaximander was not doing substance metaphysics but **ontology of relation**. He was asking not "What is everything made of?" but **"What does it mean to be something rather than nothing?"** To articulate this thesis, I employ the **Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalist (NPN) framework**, a system of first-principles metaphysics developed in my earlier work.[10] Central to this framework are two principles: the **General Zero**

[5] Simplicius, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Commentaria*, ed. Hermann Diels, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 9 (Berlin: Reimer, 1882), 24.13–25. The fragment is standardly cited as DK 12 B 1. For a recent translation and commentary, see Graham, 48–53.

[6] G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 105–23, esp. 110: "Aristotle certainly supposed that Anaximander was talking about a material *archē* (*ἀρχή*)."

[7] Kahn, 231–45, while nuanced, ultimately reads the *Apeiron* as a "generative substance."

[8] Beekes, 118: "*a-* privative + *peirar* 'end, boundary'." See also Chantraine, 887, which emphasizes the term's connection to spatial and conceptual limits.

[9] Vlastos, 165–68, argues that *Dikē* in early Greek thought represents a "cosmic principle of reciprocity and balance," not a moral injunction.

[10] Deutscher. For the foundational axioms of the NPN system, see Appendix B: "The First Principles of Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalism."

Principle (GZP) and its specific application, the **Zero Principle (ZP)**.[11] This paper applies these principles to Anaximander's fragment, demonstrating that his system constitutes the first historical expression of relational ontology and provides the logical foundation that Aristotle's substance-based metaphysics would later obscure.

The implications of this reinterpretation are profound. It suggests that the earliest stratum of Western metaphysical thought was not a crude materialism, but a sophisticated **logic of identity-as-contrast**—a logic that was systematically overwritten by the Aristotelian substance paradigm and is only now being recovered through the relational turn in contemporary philosophy and physics.[12] By reading Anaximander through the NPN lens, we not only correct a historical misreading but also reclaim a powerful metaphysical tool for understanding systems, identity, and time.

---

2 Defining the Principles: GZP and ZP

Before analyzing Anaximander, it is essential to define the conceptual tools. The NPN framework begins with what I term the **General Zero Principle (GZP)**, a transcendental condition for any determination whatsoever.[13]

> **GZP:** For anything to possess determinate identity, meaning, or existence, it must exist within a delimited context set against an **indeterminate background**. The ultimate foundation cannot itself be determinate, for then it would require further foundation. It must be **indeterminate**.

GZP is a logical necessity about the structure of determination itself. To define "A" requires "not-A." If "not-A" is also determinate ("B"), an infinite regress ensues. The regress stops only at the indeterminate—the background that is not a "thing" but the condition for things. This principle finds echoes in traditions ranging from the Buddhist concept of *śūnyatā* (emptiness) to the *via negativa* of apophatic theology, but it is here formulated as a strict logical requirement.[14]

[11] **General Zero Principle (GZP):** "For anything to possess determinate identity, meaning, or existence, it must exist within a delimited context set against an **indeterminate background**." **Zero Principle (ZP):** "For any determinate system to exist, there must be an indeterminate complement—a not-system." See Deutscher, 173–83, and Appendix B, section B.2., "The Ground: The Precondition of Existence."

[12] On the "relational turn" in contemporary metaphysics and physics, see Rovelli, 47: "The world is not made of things that evolve in time; it is made of processes, of events." See also Smolin, which argues for a process-based cosmology.

[13] Deutscher, 34–35. GZP is presented as the first axiom of the system, derived from the impossibility of an infinite regress of determination.

[14] For a comparative analysis of indeterminate grounds in Eastern and Western thought, see Loy. Loy argues that the recognition of an indeterminate background is a cross-cultural philosophical invariant.

From GZP follows the more specific **Zero Principle (ZP)**, which applies to systems and entities:[15]

> **ZP:** For any determinate system to exist, there must be an indeterminate complement—a not-system. Identity is not intrinsic but relational, defined by emergence from a contrasting field.

ZP states that to be a "something" is to be bounded, and to be bounded is to have an "outside." A system with no outside is indistinguishable from the whole of reality and thus has no identity of its own. This principle resonates with Gregory Bateson's definition of information as "a difference that makes a difference,"[16] and with systems theory's insistence on the system-environment distinction as constitutive of systemic identity.[17]

Principle	Scope	Application to Anaximander
General Zero Principle (GZP)	Logic of determination itself. The necessity of an indeterminate ground for any/all determination.	The *Apeiron* as the necessary indeterminate background for any determinate thing to appear.
Zero Principle (ZP)	Ontology of systems/entities. The necessity of an outside/complement for a system's identity.	The emergence of a particular (hot, cold, dry, wet) as a bounded system against the boundless *Apeiron*.

With these principles defined, we can now turn to the fragment and ask: does Anaximander's system reflect this relational logic? The following section reconstructs his four-step cycle of identity, demonstrating that it is a precise pre-figuration of ZP.

---

3 The Fragment and the Four-Step Relational Cycle

The core of Anaximander's thought is preserved in a single fragment (Diels and Kranz 12B1):[18]

> "Whence things have their origin, there they must also pass away according to necessity; for they must pay penalty and be judged for their injustice, according to the ordinance of Time." (Simplicius, *Commentary on Aristotle's Physics*, 24.13)

[15] Deutscher, 35–37. ZP is presented as the ontological corollary of GZP, applying the logic of contrast to concrete systems.

[16] Bateson, 453: "In fact, what we mean by information—the elementary unit of information—is a difference which makes a difference."

[17] Luhmann, 16–20, defines a system by the boundary that separates it from its environment, a boundary maintained through autopoiesis.

[18] Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed., vol. 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1951), 89. The standard Greek text reads: "ἐξ ὧν δὲ ἡ γένεσίς ἐστι τοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τὴν φθορὰν εἰς ταῦτα γίνεσθαι κατὰ τὸ χρεών·διδόναι γὰρ αὐτὰ δίκην καὶ τίσιν ἀλλήλοις τῆς ἀδικίας κατὰ τὴν τοῦ χρόνου τάξιν."

Simplicius provides the crucial context: Anaximander spoke of the *Apeiron* as the origin of all things, from which opposites (hot/cold, wet/dry) are "separated out." The fragment does not describe a linear creation myth but a **cyclical process of emergence and return**.[19] When read through the lens of ZP, this process maps onto a coherent four-step cycle of identity:

3.1 Step 1: The Boundless Ground (*Apeiron*)

The *Apeiron* is the **indeterminate, unbounded whole**—the necessary background against which anything determinate can appear. In NPN terms, this is the **indeterminate complement required by the Zero Principle**.[20] Kahn notes that "the Unlimited is not a qualitatively distinct element… but the inexhaustible source from which all particular forms emerge."[21] It is not "stuff" but the **relational precondition** for boundedness. This interpretation aligns with recent scholarship that reads the *Apeiron* as a "principle of unlimited possibility" rather than a material reservoir.[22]

3.2 Step 2: The Cut of Individuation (*Adikia*)

To become a thing is to be **cut out** from the *Apeiron*. This act of separation is the primal "injustice"—the violation of primordial unity. Kirk, Raven, and Schofield discuss this as the "unjust encroachment of opposites upon one another."[23] Identity is born through **contrast**: being something means **not being everything else**. This step instantiates ZP directly: the determinate entity emerges *as* a contrast against the indeterminate *Apeiron*.

3.3 Step 3: The Measure of Distinction (*Chronos*)

Once cut out, a form persists. **Time (*χρόνος*) measures how long this distinction can be maintained** against the dissolving pull of the boundless. The phrase "according to the ordinance of Time" (*kata tēn tou chronou taxin*) is key: Kahn interprets *taxis* (*τάξις*) as "ordinance" or "assessment" that limits duration,[24] while Barnes renders it "according to the assessment of Time."[25] Time is an **active assessor of contrast-persistence**. This anticipates the NPN **First Principle of Becoming (FP2)**, which states that "Being is a stabilized pattern within Becoming."[26] Time here is not a passive dimension but the active metric of a system's struggle to maintain its boundedness.

[19] Kahn, 166–98, emphasizes the cyclical nature of the process, arguing against a linear cosmogonic interpretation.
[20] Deutscher, 35–36.
[21] Kahn, 238.
[22] Gregory, 43–83, argues that the *Apeiron* is best understood as a "principle of metaphysical infinity," a reading that supports the NPN interpretation.
[23] Kirk, Raven, and Schofield, 119.
[24] Kahn, 172.
[25] Barnes, 29.
[26] Deutscher, Appendix B, "FP2: First Principle of Becoming: Diachronic Primacy."

3.4 Step 4: The Re-Cut of Dissolution (*Dikē*)

No distinction is permanent. *Dikē* is the **force that cuts the form back into the *Apeiron***. This is the "penalty" for the "injustice" of individuation: the necessary re-integration of the temporary into the eternal. Lloyd-Jones connects this cosmic *Dikē* to the broader Greek conception of justice as a balancing force in the universe.[27] In NPN terms, *Dikē* is the ontological enforcement of contrast-temporality—the 'cosmic scissor' that undoes individuation and returns the determinate system to the indeterminate complement (*Apeiron*).

Step	Anaximander's Concept	NPN Formalization (via ZP)
1	**The Boundless *Apeiron***	The **indeterminate complement** required by ZP. The background of all determination.
2	**The Cut *Adikia***	**Emergence of a determinate system** through contrast/separation from the background.
3	**The Measure (*Chronos*)**	**Duration of contrast-maintenance**. The "assessment" of how long a boundary can be held.
4	**The Re-Cut *Dikē***	**Dissolution of contrast**—the system's boundaries fail, and it returns to the indeterminate complement.

This cycle is not a physical description but a **logical description of identity itself**: to be something is to be temporarily bounded against the boundless. The key to understanding this lies in the specific words Anaximander chose—words that signify relations, not substances. The following etymological analysis provides decisive evidence for this reading.

---

4 4. Deep Etymological Analysis: Why His Words Matter

The decisive evidence for a relational rather than substantial reading comes from the etymology and semantic range of Anaximander's core terms. A comparison with the vocabulary available to him in 6th-century BCE Greek reveals that he consistently selected words denoting **states, actions, and relations** over words denoting **materials, stuffs, or essences**. This lexical precision indicates a conceptual framework oriented toward process and contrast, not substance and substrate.

[27] Lloyd-Jones, 32–35.

4.1 4.1 *A-peiron* (*ἄπειρον*): The "Not-Bounded"

The term is a compound of the privative prefix *a-* ("not," "without") and *peirar* ("boundary," "limit," "end").[28] It is an adjective meaning **"boundless," "unlimited," "indefinite."**

Crucially, it is *not* a noun for a kind of "stuff." If Anaximander had intended a material principle, he had numerous options: - ***Hydōr* (*ὕδωρ*)** – "water," used by Thales as the *archē* (*ἀρχή*). - ***Aēr* (*ἀήρ*)** – "air," used by Anaximenes. - ***Hylē* (*ὕλη*)** – originally "wood," later "matter." (This term becomes central in Aristotle but is not attested as a cosmic principle in the 6th century). - ***Physis* (*φύσις*)** – "nature," "growth" – which could denote a generative source.

He chose none of these. He chose a term that describes a **state or condition**—the condition of **having no boundaries**. This is a description of a **relational field**, not a substance. The *Apeiron* is the logical correlate required by ZP: the unbounded background against which bounded figures emerge.

The Privative Consensus: A Universal Boundary Condition This relational logic is preserved—and arguably amplified—in every standard English translation. **"Un-limited," "In-definite,"** and **"Bound-less"** are all privative constructions. They do not name a substance; they name the **negation of a constraint**.

- To **limit** something is to bind it—to define its boundary.
- To be "defined" is to be finite; to be "in-definite" is to lack that finitude.
- To be "bounded" is to be a figure; to be "bound-less" is to be the ground.

This aligns with Anaximander's assertion that the *Apeiron* **"surrounds"** (*periechein*) all things.[29] Structural containment is the ultimate expression of the Zero Principle: the *Apeiron* is the **"Thing Surrounding"**—the indeterminate field—while the determinate *Archē* is the **"Thing Surrounded."** The translations themselves confess what Aristotle tried to hide: we are dealing with a boundary condition, not a building block.

4.2 4.2 *A-dikia* (*ἀδικία*) and *Di-kē* (*δίκη*): The "Not-Just" and "The Cut"

The terms for the act of individuation (*Adikia*) and dissolution (*Dikē*) are even more revealing. They are built on the root *dik-*, which fundamentally relates to **"pointing out," "showing," "separating," and "judging."**[30]

- ***A-dikia*:** The *a-* prefix again signifies privation. *Dikē* means "justice," but its root is about separation and judgment. Thus, *a-dikia* literally means **"the state of being not-separated-justly"** or **"the condition of improper separation."** Vlastos argues that in early Greek thought, *Dikē* represented "the reparation of opposites," making *Adikia* the

[28] Beekes, 118.
[29] Kirk, Raven, and Schofield, 109.
[30] Beekes, 332.

state of imbalance that requires correction.[31] This is not a moral term but a **relational and logical one**: the act of creating a bounded entity is, from the perspective of the unbounded whole, an "injustice."

- ***Di-kē*:** This is the action noun from the same root. It means **"the cut," "the division," "the judgment."** In Anaximander's cycle, it is the force that **re-cuts** the entity, dissolving its boundaries and returning it to the whole.

The available alternative vocabulary here would have been causal or substantial. He could have spoken of *genesis* (*γένεσις*) ("coming-to-be") and *phthora* (*φθορά*) ("passing-away"), as later philosophers did. Instead, he chose terms from the semantic field of **separation, judgment, and balance**. This frames existence not as a change of substance but as a **temporary state of separatedness** within a relational whole.

4.3 *Chronos* (*χρόνος*) as *Taxis* (*τάξις*): Time as "Ordering"

The phrase "according to the *taxis* of Time" (*kata tēn tou chronou taxin*) is pivotal. *Taxis* means "order," "arrangement," "ordinance." It implies an active arranging or assessing power.[32] Time is not an empty container but the **active assessor** that measures and enforces the limit of each entity's separated existence. This aligns perfectly with ZP's implication that bounded identity is inherently **temporal**—it can only persist for a duration measured against the timeless background. This view of Time as an active, normative force is a distinctive feature of Anaximander's system, one that finds a modern echo in Ilya Prigogine's concept of Time as an intrinsic property of irreversible processes.[33]

Anaximander's Term	Literal Etymology & Meaning	Substance-Based Alternative He Did *Not* Choose
Apeiron	*a-* (not) + *peirar* (boundary) = **"not-bounded"** (state/condition)	*Hydōr* (*ὕδωρ*) (water), *Aēr* (*ἀήρ*) (air), *Hylē* (*ὕλη*) (matter)
Adikia	*a-* (not) + *Dikē* (separation/judgment) = **"not-just/improper separation"** (relational state)	*Genesis* (*γένεσις*) (coming-to-be), *Aitia* (*αἰτία*) (cause)
Dikē	From root *dik-* (to show, point out, judge) = **"the cut," "the judgment"** (action/process)	*Phthora* (*φθορά*) (passing-away), *Lysis* (*λύσις*) (dissolution)
Chronos* + *Taxis	Time as "ordering" or "assessing" (active principle)	*Aiōn* (*αἰών*) (lifetime, age), *Hōra* (*ὥρα*) (season, fixed time)

[31] Vlastos, 165–68.
[32] Kahn, 172.
[33] Prigogine, 14–17.

This etymological analysis demonstrates that Anaximander's lexical choices were precise and deliberate. He built his philosophical system with a vocabulary of **privation** (*a-*), **boundary** (*peirar*), **separation/judgment** (*dik-*), and **ordering** (*taxis*). This is the vocabulary of **relation, contrast, and process**, not of substance, stuff, and essence. He was articulating ZP in poetic, presocratic language: identity is a temporary boundary maintained against, and eventually succumbing to, the boundless.

---

5 Thermodynamics as Empirical Validation of the Relational Cycle

The modern science of thermodynamics provides a **striking empirical validation** of the relational logic Anaximander articulated. The principles governing energy, entropy, and time in physical systems exhibit precisely the **contrast-based, temporary-identity structure** described by the Zero Principle. This is not to claim Anaximander "predicted" thermodynamics—an anachronistic fallacy—but to show that the logical structure of identity he described is isomorphic with the structure that governs physical reality. The isomorphism is evidence that ZP captures a fundamental ontological truth.

5.1 The *Apeiron* and Thermodynamic Equilibrium

The *Apeiron* as the "boundless" corresponds structurally to the concept of **thermodynamic equilibrium**: the state of maximum entropy where no gradients exist, no work can be extracted, and no distinct forms persist.[34] This state is the physical analogue of the indeterminate background. Rudolf Clausius famously formulated this as the Second Law: "The energy of the universe is constant; the entropy of the universe tends to a maximum."[35] This captures the Anaximandrian vision of a constant whole within which temporary forms arise and decay. The physicist Arthur Eddington would later call entropy "time's arrow"—the fundamental directionality from order to disorder that governs all physical processes.[36]

5.2 *Adikia* as Local Entropy Decrease

The "injustice" (*Adikia*) of individuation—the carving of a bounded entity from the boundless—finds its thermodynamic counterpart in **local entropy decrease**. When any organized system forms (a crystal, a cell, a star), it creates internal order by exporting disorder to its environment.[37] This is what Erwin Schrödinger identified as the defining characteristic of life: organisms maintain themselves by "continually sucking orderliness from their environment"—feeding on what

[34] Clausius.
[35] Clausius, 365.
[36] Eddington, 74.
[37] Schrödinger.

he called "negative entropy" or *negentropy*.[38] Schrödinger's insight applies universally: **every bounded system exists by maintaining a gradient against its environment**, exactly as ZP describes.

5.3 Time as the Arrow of Entropy Increase

Anaximander's Time that "assesses" and enforces limits is the **thermodynamic arrow of time**—the irreversible increase of entropy. Ilya Prigogine's work on dissipative structures demonstrated that for systems far from equilibrium, "time is no longer an external parameter; it becomes an intrinsic property of the system, related to its irreversibility."[39] This mirrors Anaximander's conception: Time is not a neutral container but **the measure of a system's capacity to maintain its distinctness** against the universal trend toward equilibrium.

5.4 *Dikē* as Entropic Dissolution

The "justice" (*Dikē*) that dissolves forms back into the *Apeiron* is **entropy maximization**: the inevitable breakdown of gradients, the diffusion of energy, the return to equilibrium. Ludwig Boltzmann's statistical interpretation of entropy showed that ordered states are statistically improbable—they naturally tend toward disorder.[40] This is not punishment but **natural law**, as Eddington described: "The law that entropy always increases—the second law of thermodynamics—holds, I think, the supreme position among the laws of Nature."[41]

Anaximander's Cycle	ZP Formalization	Thermodynamic Process	Key Proponent
***Apeiron* (Boundless)**	Indeterminate complement	Thermodynamic equilibrium (max entropy)	Clausius, Gibbs
***Adikia* (Injustice)**	Emergence of bounded system	Local entropy decrease / Gradient formation	Schrödinger, Boltzmann
Time as Assessor	Measure of contrast-persistence	Thermodynamic arrow of time	Eddington, Prigogine
***Dikē* (Justice)**	Dissolution of bounded system	Entropy increase / Gradient dissipation	Boltzmann, Clausius

This isomorphism is profound: it shows that **the logic of identity Anaximander described is the same logic that governs physical reality**. The Zero Principle is not merely a philosophical abstraction; it is a **structural truth about how determinate systems exist in a universe**

[38] Schrödinger, 72.
[39] Prigogine and Stengers, 12–15.
[40] Boltzmann.
[41] Eddington, 74.

tending toward equilibrium. The validation of ZP by thermodynamics strengthens the case for reading Anaximander as a philosopher of relation, not substance.

---

6 The Aristotelian Legacy and Its Modern Overthrow

Aristotle's reinterpretation of earlier philosophy through his substance ontology did more than obscure Anaximander's relational insight—it established a **two-thousand-year metaphysical paradigm** that would dominate Western thought until the scientific revolutions of the modern era. This paradigm shift represented what Alfred North Whitehead would later call "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness"—the error of treating abstract categories as more fundamentally real than the processes they describe.[42]

6.1 Aristotle's Static, Substance-Based Universe

Aristotle constructed a **perfect, hierarchical, and essentially static cosmos** where everything had its proper place and purpose (*telos* (*τέλος*)). In his *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, he established substance (*ousia* (*οὐσία*)) as primary reality—the independent, enduring "thing" that persists through change.[43] This framework systematically translated Anaximander's dynamic, relational terms into static, substantial categories:

- **The *Apeiron* became *hylē aoristos*** ("indefinite matter"), a passive substratum waiting to be informed by shape and purpose (*Physics* III.4, 203b7-15).
- **The process of *Adikia* and *Dikē*** became **moral and legal metaphors** rather than ontological descriptions of identity formation and dissolution.
- **Time** ceased to be an active assessor and became **merely the measure of motion** in a fundamentally unchanging cosmos (*Physics* IV.11, 219b1-2).

This translation was not accidental but systematic. As Werner Jaeger demonstrated, Aristotle "projected his own concept of *hylē* (*ὕλη*) (matter) back onto the Presocratics, distorting their original metaphysical insights."[44] The consequence was profound: **the relational, process-oriented metaphysics of the Pre-Socratics was overwritten by a substance-based, hierarchical worldview that would endure for two millennia.**

6.2 The Medieval Synthesis and Its Consequences

The medieval synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian theology—most notably in Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica*—further cemented this substance paradigm. Aquinas's

[42] Whitehead, 72.
[43] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book VII (Z), esp. 1028a10–31. See also Loux.
[44] Jaeger, 29.

"Five Ways" argument for God's existence rested on Aristotelian categories of causation and substance.[45] The cosmos became a **perfectly ordered, teleological hierarchy** stretching from prime matter to the Unmoved Mover—a vision that left little room for Anaximander's dynamic cycle of emergence and return.

This Aristotelian-medieval universe was characterized by:

1. **Essential natures** rather than relational identities
2. **Final causes** (*tele* (*τέλη*)) rather than dynamic processes
3. **A static celestial realm** contrasted with a corruptible sublunary world
4. **Qualitative physics** based on the four elements and their natural places

As historian of science Alexandre Koyré would later describe it, this was the world of the "closed world" that would need to be shattered for modern science to emerge.[46]

6.3 The Slow Return to Process: From Newton to Thermodynamics

The scientific revolutions that began in the 17th century represented a gradual return to process-oriented thinking, though still within largely mechanistic frameworks:

- **Newton's physics** reintroduced mathematics and dynamics but maintained absolute space and time as containers—still a form of substantial thinking.[47]
- **Leibniz's calculus and monadology** offered a more relational alternative, but his influence was overshadowed by Newton's success.[48]
- **Kant's critical philosophy** attempted to reconcile Newtonian mechanics with human cognition but remained within a framework of substances and their properties.[49]

It was not until the 19th century, with the development of **thermodynamics**, that science fully began to recover the relational, process-oriented worldview that Anaximander had articulated. The laws of thermodynamics—particularly the Second Law's arrow of time and the concept of entropy—described a universe of **gradients, processes, and temporary structures** rather than enduring substances.

6.4 Modern Physics as the Triumph of Anaximandrian Relationality

The 20th century completed this revolution, demonstrating conclusively that Aristotle's substance-based universe was inadequate to describe physical reality:

[45] Aquinas, I, q. 2, a. 3. For the Aristotelian underpinnings, see Gilson.
[46] Koyré, 2.
[47] Newton, "Scholium" to the Definitions.
[48] Leibniz, §§1–3, in Leibniz, 213–25.
[49] Kant.

1. **Quantum Mechanics:** Particles are not independent substances but **relational entities** whose properties emerge only through interaction. Niels Bohr's principle of complementarity and the phenomenon of quantum entanglement reveal a world where identity is fundamentally relational.[50]
2. **Relativity Theory:** Space and time are not absolute containers but **relational aspects** of a spacetime continuum. Einstein's theories demonstrate that there are no privileged reference frames—all measurements are relational.[51]
3. **Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics:** The arrow of time and irreversibility are fundamental, not derived. Ilya Prigogine showed that **"being becomes process"** in far-from-equilibrium systems, directly echoing Anaximander's dynamic cycle.[52]
4. **Complex Systems and Emergence:** Modern systems theory, from ecology to neuroscience, describes reality as **nested networks of relations** where identity emerges from interaction, not precedes it. As Stuart Kauffman argues, life itself is "the natural outcome of self-organizing processes in complex systems."[53]

Period	Dominant Metaphysics	Key Features	Relation to Anaximander
Pre-Socratic (6th c. BCE)	**Process/Relational** (Anaximander)	Identity as temporary contrast; Dynamic cycles; No prime substance	Original expression of ZP
Aristotelian-Medieval (4th c. BCE–16th c.)	**Substance/Essence** (Aristotle)	Essential natures; Teleology; Static hierarchy; Qualities	ZP obscured; relational terms translated into substances
Early Modern (17th–18th c.)	**Mechanistic** (Newton)	Mathematical laws; Absolute space/time; Corpuscular matter	Partial return to process but still substantial
Modern (19th–20th c.)	**Relational/Process** (Thermodynamics, QM, Relativity)	Gradients and flows; Relational spacetime; Emergent properties; Arrow of time	Full recovery and validation of ZP

[50] Bohr, 580–90; Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen, 777–80.
[51] Einstein, 891–921; Einstein, 844–47.
[52] Prigogine, 14.
[53] Kauffman, 71.

6.5 Why This Matters: Anaximander's Vindication

This historical trajectory reveals something profound: **modern science has progressively validated Anaximander's relational ontology while demonstrating the limitations of Aristotle's substance-based framework.** Where Aristotle saw enduring essences, we now see **temporary patterns maintained through energy flow**. Where Aristotle saw fixed hierarchies, we now see **dynamic networks of relations**. Where Aristotle saw qualitative differences, we now see **gradients and phase transitions**.

The physicist Carlo Rovelli, in his work on quantum gravity, has explicitly argued for a return to relational thinking: "The world is not made of things that evolve in time; it is made of processes, of events."[54] This is not merely a scientific observation but a **metaphysical insight that Anaximander articulated twenty-six centuries ago.**

The Zero Principle, as formalized in the NPN framework, provides the philosophical foundation for this modern understanding. It explains why:

1. **Quantum entities** have no intrinsic properties until measured (relational identity)
2. **Biological organisms** exist only by maintaining gradients against their environments (temporary boundedness)
3. **Cosmological structures** from stars to galaxies are temporary configurations in an expanding, entropic universe

Aristotle's universe of substances and essences served Western thought for two millennia, but it was ultimately a **metaphysical detour** from the more fundamental insight that Anaximander had glimpsed: that to be is to be *in relation*, *temporarily*, against a boundless background. The NPN framework, by making this insight explicit as ZP, provides the conceptual tools to complete the relational turn in contemporary thought.

---

7 Implications and Conclusion: Recovering the First Metaphysics of Relation

Anaximander was not a primitive materialist groping toward the concept of matter. He was the **first philosopher of relation**, articulating a coherent ontology in which:

1. **Identity is contrastive (ZP):** To be something is to be bounded, and to be bounded is to have an outside (the *Apeiron*).
2. **Contrast is temporal:** This bounded state is temporary, measured and limited by Time as active assessor.

[54] Rovelli, 47.

3. **The cycle is logical, not merely physical:** The process of *Adikia* ⟶ *Dikē* is the life-cycle of identity itself.

The **Zero Principle** formalizes Anaximander's fundamental insight. By recovering this insight, we achieve more than a historical correction:

1. **We recover a Pre-Socratic tradition of process and relation** that was overwritten by the substance paradigm. Recent scholars like Andrew Gregory have called for a "re-assessment" of Anaximander that takes seriously his systematic and proto-scientific thinking.[55] The NPN framework provides the precise metaphysical vocabulary for this re-assessment.
2. **We provide an ancient, rigorous foundation for contemporary process philosophy, systems theory, and ecological thought**, all of which treat entities as nodes in networks or patterns in flux, rather than isolated substances. ZP offers a first-principle justification for this shift.
3. **We demonstrate that modern thermodynamics empirically validates** the relational structure Anaximander described, showing his insight was not prescientific but pre-scientifically profound. The isomorphism between his cycle and thermodynamic laws suggests that ZP captures a deep structural truth about reality.
4. **We ground the NPN framework** in the earliest stratum of Western philosophical thought, showing that its first principles are not novel inventions but rediscoveries of a repressed logical necessity. This historical grounding strengthens the framework's claim to universality.

In the *Apeiron*—the "not-bounded"—Anaximander identified the indispensable ground of all that is bounded. In doing so, he gave us the first, and perhaps purest, expression of the Zero Principle: that to be is to be *for a time*, as a figure against a ground, a cut in the boundless whole. His vocabulary of privation, boundary, separation, and ordering was not accidental but essential—the precise linguistic toolkit needed to articulate a relational ontology.

Twenty-six centuries later, physics and philosophy are finally catching up to his insight. The relational turn in modern science, the rise of process metaphysics, and the systems-theoretic understanding of life all point toward the same conclusion: **identity is relational, temporal, and contrast-dependent.** By formalizing this insight as the Zero Principle within the Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalist framework, we not only correct the Aristotelian misreading of Anaximander but also provide a robust metaphysical foundation for the 21st century's understanding of a dynamic, interconnected, and processual reality. Anaximander's *Apeiron* is not a relic of primitive thought; it is the first map of the territory we are only now learning to navigate.

[55] Gregory, 43–83.

References

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. 1274.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Ed. by Jonathan Barnes. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Barnes, Jonathan. *Early Greek Philosophy*. 2nd. London: Penguin, 2001. ISBN: 978-0-14-044815-3.

Bateson, Gregory. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972. ISBN: 978-0-226-03905-3.

Beekes, Robert. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Vol. 10. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2010. ISBN: 978-90-04-17418-4.

Bohr, Niels. "The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory." *Nature* 121 (1928): 580–590. https://doi.org/10.1038/121580a0.

Boltzmann, Ludwig. *Lectures on Gas Theory*. Trans. by Stephen G. Brush. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968. ISBN: 978-2-252-03475-2.

Clausius, Rudolf. *The Mechanical Theory of Heat*. Trans. by T. Archer Hirst. London: John van Voorst, 1865.

Deutscher, Eli Adam. *Neo-Pre-Platonic Naturalism: A First-Principles Framework for Reality, Mind, and Knowledge*. Pre-Release First Edition. United States: Neo-Pre-Platonic Press, 2025. ISBN: 978-1-971183-00-8.

Diels, Hermann, and Walther Kranz. "Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker," 6th, vol. 1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1951.

Eddington, Arthur S. *The Nature of the Physical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Einstein, Albert. "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies." *Annalen der Physik* 17 (1905): 891–921. https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.19053221004.

– . "The Field Equations of Gravitation." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1915): 844–847.

Einstein, Albert, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen. "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?" *Physical Review* 47 (1935): 777–780. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.47.777.

Gilson, Étienne. *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Trans. by L. K. Shook. New York: Random House, 1956. ISBN: 978-0-7581-2098-8.

Graham, Daniel W. *Explaining the Cosmos: The Ionian Tradition of Scientific Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. ISBN: 978-0-691-12540-4.

– . *The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy: The Complete Fragments and Selected Testimonies of the Major Presocratics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. ISBN: 978-0-521-73843-6.

Gregory, Andrew. *Anaximander: A Re-assessment*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. ISBN: 978-1-4725-0620-5.

Jaeger, Werner. *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. ISBN: 978-0-19-814361-8.

Kahn, Charles H. *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960. ISBN: 978-0-231-01755-7.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. ISBN: 978-0-521-35402-8.

Kauffman, Stuart. *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993. ISBN: 978-0-19-507951-7.

Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. 2nd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. ISBN: 978-0-521-27455-5.

Koyré, Alexandre. *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957. ISBN: 978-0-8018-0220-5.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Monadology*. 1714.

– . "Monadology." In *Philosophical Essays*, trans. by Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber, 213–225. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1989. ISBN: 978-0-87220-063-5.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. *The Justice of Zeus*. 2nd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. ISBN: 978-0-520-04705-9.

Loux, Michael J. *Primary Ousia: An Essay on Aristotle's Metaphysics Z and H*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991. ISBN: 978-0-8014-9928-6.

Loy, David. *Nonduality: A Study in Comparative Philosophy*. New York: Humanity Books, 1998. ISBN: 978-1-57392-359-0.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Social Systems*. Trans. by John Jr. Bednarz. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. ISBN: 978-0-8047-2625-2.

Newton, Isaac. *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. London: Joseph Streater, 1687.

Prigogine, Ilya. *The End of Certainty: Time, Chaos, and the New Laws of Nature*. New York: Free Press, 1996. ISBN: 978-0-684-83705-5.

Prigogine, Ilya, and Isabelle Stengers. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. New York: Bantam, 1984. ISBN: 978-0-553-34082-2.

Rovelli, Carlo. *The Order of Time*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2018. ISBN: 978-0-7352-1610-5.

Schrödinger, Erwin. *What Is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944. ISBN: 978-1-107-60218-1.

Simplicius. "In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Commentaria," ed. by Hermann Diels, vol. 9. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca. Berlin: Reimer, 1882.

Smolin, Lee. *The Life of the Cosmos*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. ISBN: 978-0-19-512664-8.

Vlastos, Gregory. "Equality and Justice in Early Greek Cosmologies." *Classical Philology* 42, no. 3 (1947): 156–178. https://doi.org/10.1086/363040.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Science and the Modern World*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.